

Mass and 3-metrics of Non-negative Scalar Curvature

Robert Bartnik*

Abstract

Physicists believe, with some justification, that there should be a correspondence between familiar properties of Newtonian gravity and properties of solutions of the Einstein equations. The Positive Mass Theorem (PMT), first proved over twenty years ago [45, 53], is a remarkable testament to this faith. However, fundamental mathematical questions concerning mass in general relativity remain, associated with the definition and properties of quasi-local mass. Central themes are the structure of metrics with non-negative scalar curvature, and the role played by minimal area 2-spheres (black holes).

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification: 53C99, 83C57.

Keywords and Phrases: Quasi-local mass, Einstein equations, Scalar curvature.

1. Positive Mass Theorem

The Positive Mass Theorem provides a good example of “*the unreasonable effectiveness of physics in mathematics*¹”. The need to define mass in general relativity is motivated directly by the physics imperative to establish a correspondence between general relativity and classical Newtonian gravity. Already difficulties arise: although the vacuum Einstein equations $Ric_{\alpha\beta} - \frac{1}{2}Rg_{\alpha\beta} = 0$ for the Lorentz metric $g_{\alpha\beta}$ suggest (by analogy with the wave equation, for example) that a mass (energy) which includes contributions from the gravitational field, should be built from the first derivatives of the field $g_{\alpha\beta}$, it is clear that this is incompatible with coordinate invariance.

The Schwarzschild vacuum spacetime metric, for $r > \max(0, 2M)$,

$$ds^2 = - (1 - 2M/r) dt^2 + \frac{dr^2}{1 - 2M/r} + r^2(d\vartheta^2 + \sin^2 \vartheta d\varphi^2), \quad (1.1)$$

*School of Mathematics and Statistics, University of Canberra, ACT 2601, Australia. E-mail: robert.bartnik@canberra.edu.au

¹with apologies to Eugene Wigner [52].

provides an important clue, since the parameter $M \in \mathbb{R}$ governs the behaviour of timelike geodesics and may be regarded as the total mass. Note that $M > 0$ ensures the boundary $r = 2M$ is smooth and totally geodesic in the hypersurfaces $t = \text{const.}$

A Riemannian 3-manifold (M, g) is said to be *asymptotically flat* if $M \setminus K \simeq \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus B_1(0)$ for some compact K , and M admits a metric $\hat{g}$ which is flat outside K , and the metric components g_{ij} in the induced rectangular coordinates satisfy

$$|g_{ij} - \hat{g}_{ij}| = O(r^{-1}), \quad |\partial_k g_{ij}| = O(r^{-2}), \quad |\partial_k \partial_l g_{ij}| = O(r^{-3}). \quad (1.2)$$

The total mass of (M, g) is defined informally by [1]

$$m_{ADM} = \frac{1}{16\pi} \oint_{S^2(\infty)} (\partial_i g_{ij} - \partial_j g_{ii}) dS_j. \quad (1.3)$$

If the scalar curvature $R(g) \in L^1(M)$ then m_{ADM} is well-defined, independent of the choices of rectangular coordinates and of exhaustion of M used to define $\oint_{S^2(\infty)}$ — see [3, 15, 37] for weaker decay and smoothness assumptions.

For simplicity, the discussion here is restricted to C^∞ Riemannian 3-dimensional geometry. This corresponds to the case of time-symmetric initial data: (M, g) is a totally geodesic spacelike hypersurface in a Lorentzian manifold, and we can identify the local matter (equivalently, energy) density with the scalar curvature $R(g) \geq 0$. This simplification entails a small loss of generality: most, but not all, of the results we describe have been extended to general asymptotically flat space-time initial data (M, g, K) , where K_{ij} is the second fundamental form of a spacelike hypersurface M . Some results also generalize to the closely related Bondi mass, which measures mass and gravitational radiation flux near null infinity, and to mass on asymptotically hyperbolic and anti-deSitter spaces cf. [51, 16], but these involve additional complications which we will not discuss here.

The Positive Mass Theorem (PMT) in its simplest form is

Theorem 1 *Suppose (M, g) is a complete asymptotically flat 3-manifold with non-negative scalar curvature $R(g) \geq 0$. Then $m_{ADM} \geq 0$, and $m_{ADM} = 0$ iff $(M, g) = (\mathbb{R}^3, \delta)$.*

The rigidity conclusion in the case $m_{ADM} = 0$ shows that $m_{ADM} > 0$ for (M, g) scalar flat (“matter-free”) but non-flat, so m_{ADM} does provide a measure of the gravitational field.

Three distinct approaches have been successfully used to prove the PMT: with stable minimal surfaces [45, 46]; with spinors [53, 36] and the Schrödinger-Lichnerowicz identity [48, 35]; and using the Geroch foliation condition [23, 30]. A number of other approaches have produced partial results: using spacetime geodesics [42]; a nonlinear elliptic system for a distinguished orthonormal frame [39, 18]; and alternative foliation conditions [32, 33, 6]. The connection between these approaches remains mysterious; the only discernable common thread is mean curvature, and this is quite tenuous.

The application of the positive mass theorem to resolve the Yamabe conjecture [44, 34] is well known. Less well known is the proof of the uniqueness of the

Schwarzschild spacetime amongst static metrics with smooth black hole boundary [13], which we briefly outline.

A *static spacetime* is a Lorentzian 4-manifold with a hypersurface-orthogonal timelike Killing vector. With V denoting the length of the Killing vector, the metric g on the spacelike hypersurface satisfies the static equations

$$\begin{aligned} Ric_g &= V^{-1} \nabla^2 V, \\ \Delta_g V &= 0. \end{aligned} \tag{1.4}$$

Smoothness implies the boundary set $\Sigma = \{V = 0\}$ is totally geodesic; analyticity of g, V can be used to show the asymptotic expansions

$$\begin{aligned} g_{ij} &= (1 + 2m/r) \delta_{ij} + O(r^{-2}), \\ V &= 1 - m/r + O(r^{-2}), \end{aligned}$$

as $r \rightarrow \infty$ for some constant $m \in \mathbb{R}$. The metrics $g^\pm = \phi_\pm^4 g$ where $\phi_\pm = (1 \pm V)/2$ both have $R(g^\pm) = 0$, and g^+ is asymptotically flat with vanishing ADM mass, and g^- is a (smooth) metric on a compact manifold. Gluing two copies of (M, g) along the totally geodesic boundary Σ and conformally changing to $\tilde{g} = \tilde{\phi}^4 g$ where $\tilde{\phi} = \phi_\pm$ on the two copies of M , gives a complete AF manifold with $R(\tilde{g}) = 0$ and vanishing mass. The PMT shows $(\tilde{M}, \tilde{g})$ is flat and it follows without difficulty that (M, g) is Schwarzschild. This extends previous results [31, 43] which required the boundary to be connected.

2. Penrose conjecture

A boundary component Σ with mean curvature $H = 0$ is called a *black hole* or *horizon*, since if (M, g) is a totally geodesic hypersurface then Σ is a trapped surface and hence, by the Penrose singularity theorem [26], lies within an event horizon and is destined to encounter geodesic incompleteness in the predictable future.

The spatial Schwarzschild metric $g = \frac{dr^2}{1-2M/r} + r^2(d\vartheta^2 + \sin\vartheta d\varphi^2)$ with $M < 0$ shows that the completeness condition in the PMT is important, but it can be weakened to allow horizon boundary components of M . This follows immediately from the minimal surface argument [45]; or by an extension to the Witten argument [22], imposing one of the boundary conditions

$$\psi = \pm \epsilon \psi \text{ on } \Sigma = \partial M, \tag{2.1}$$

on the spinor field ψ , where $\epsilon = \gamma^n \gamma^0$ satisfies $\epsilon^2 = 1$. An interesting extension is obtained by imposing the spectral boundary condition

$$P_+ \psi = 0 \text{ on } \Sigma \tag{2.2}$$

where P_+ is the projection onto the subspace of positive eigenspinors of the induced Dirac operator $\mathcal{D}_\Sigma$. Using the remarkable Hijazi-Bär estimate [28, 2]

$$|\lambda| \geq \sqrt{4\pi/|\Sigma|}, \tag{2.3}$$

for the eigenvalues of $\mathcal{D}_\Sigma$ when $\Sigma \simeq S^2$, Herzlich showed [27]

Theorem 2 *If (M, g) is asymptotically flat with $R(g) \geq 0$ and boundary $\Sigma \simeq S^2$ with mean curvature satisfying*

$$H_\Sigma \leq 2/r \quad (2.4)$$

where $r = \sqrt{|\Sigma|/4\pi}$, then $m_{ADM} \geq 0$, with equality iff $(M, g) = (\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus B(r), \delta)$.

The proof starts with the Riemannian form of the Schrödinger-Lichnerowicz-Witten identity [48, 35, 53]

$$\int_M (|\nabla \psi|^2 + \frac{1}{4}R(g)|\psi|^2 - |\mathcal{D}\psi|^2) dv_M = 4\pi|\psi_\infty|^2 m_{ADM} + \oint_\Sigma \mu(\psi), \quad (2.5)$$

where $\mu(\psi)$ is the Nester-Witten form [38]

$$\mu(\psi) = \langle \psi, (\mathcal{D}_\Sigma + \frac{1}{2}H_\Sigma)\psi \rangle dv_\Sigma. \quad (2.6)$$

The boundary condition $P^+\psi|_\Sigma = 0$ is elliptic and it can be shown [8] there is a spinor on M satisfying $\mathcal{D}\psi = 0$ with boundary conditions $\psi \rightarrow \psi_\infty \neq 0$ as $r \rightarrow \infty$ and (2.2) on Σ . It follows from (2.3) and (2.2) that $\langle \psi, (\mathcal{D}_\Sigma + \frac{1}{2}H_\Sigma)\psi \rangle \leq (\frac{1}{2}H_\Sigma - |\lambda_1^-|)|\psi|^2 \leq 0$ and the result follows.

Observe that in each case, equality leads to flat $\mathbb{R}^3$. An elegant physical argument lead Penrose to conjecture an analogous inequality, but which distinguishes the Schwarzschild metric instead [40], see also [24].

Conjecture 3 (Penrose) *If (M, g) satisfies the conditions of the PMT, except that $\partial M = \Sigma$ is compact with vanishing mean curvature and such that Σ is the “outermost” closed minimal surface in M , then*

$$m_{ADM} \geq \sqrt{|\Sigma|/16\pi}, \quad (2.7)$$

with equality only for the Schwarzschild metric.

A closed minimal surface is said to be an *outermost horizon* or *outer-minimizing horizon* if M contains no least area surfaces homologous to Σ in the asymptotic region exterior to Σ . The outermost condition is essential, since examples of non-negative scalar curvature manifolds can be constructed by forming the connected sum of M and large spheres by arbitrarily small and large necks.

The Penrose conjecture has been established by Huisken and Ilmanen [29, 30] using a variational level set formulation of the inverse mean curvature flow [23], and by Bray [12] by a very interesting conformal deformation argument. Bray’s proof is more general since it takes into account contributions from all the connected components of the boundary.

3. Quasi-local mass

Thus it is natural to consider $\sqrt{|\Sigma|/16\pi}$ as the mass of a black hole (minimal surface) Σ . More generally, the correspondence with Newtonian gravity suggests that any bounded region (Ω, g) should have a *quasi-local* mass, which measures both

the matter density (represented in this case by the scalar curvature $R(g) \geq 0$), and some contribution from the gravitational field. The rather satisfactory positivity properties of the total mass, as established by the PMT, motivate the properties we might expect such a geometric mass to possess [20, 14, 7].

1. **(non-negativity)** $m_{QL}(\Omega) \geq 0$;
2. **(rigidity/strict positivity)** $m_{QL}(\Omega) = 0$ if and only if (Ω, g) is flat;
3. **(monotonicity)** $m_{QL}(\Omega_1) \leq m_{QL}(\Omega_2)$ whenever $\Omega_1 \subset \Omega_2$, where it is understood that the inclusion is a metric isometry;
4. **(spherical mass)** m_{QL} should agree with the spherical mass, for spherically symmetric regions;
5. **(ADM limit)** m_{QL} should be asymptotic to the ADM mass;
6. **(black hole limit)** m_{QL} should agree with the black hole mass (2.7).

Many candidates have been proposed for quasi-local mass (see for example [10] for a comparison of some definitions), the most significant being that of Hawking [25],

$$m_H(\Sigma) = \sqrt{\frac{|\Sigma|}{16\pi}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{16\pi} \oint_{\Sigma} H^2 \right) \quad (3.1)$$

where $\Sigma = \partial\Omega$. This equals M for standard spheres in Schwarzschild. Although $m_H \leq 0$ for surfaces in $\mathbb{R}^3$, it was shown in [14] that $m_H(\Sigma) \geq 0$ for a stable constant mean curvature 2-sphere Σ in a 3-manifold of non-negative scalar curvature. Thus for such “round” spheres, m_H is nonnegative, and the black hole limit condition is trivially satisfied. However the remaining properties, in particular rigidity and monotonicity, are rather problematic. Although the twistorially-defined Penrose quasi-local mass [41] is well-behaved in special cases [50], it is defined unambiguously only for surfaces arising from embedding into a conformally flat spacetime, and even then numerical experiments [11] strongly suggest that monotonicity is violated.

In fact, of the various proposals for m_{QL} , only the definitions of [14, 5, 19] are known to satisfy positivity. Dougan and Mason [19] show that the integral $\oint_{\Sigma} \mu(\psi)$ of the Nester-Witten 2-form (2.6) is positive for spinor fields ψ on Σ which satisfy a certain elliptic system on Σ . However, Bergqvist [9] shows that positivity holds under much weaker conditions on ψ , and there are many variant definitions with similar properties. It would be useful to understand these DM-style definitions better, and in particular whether any satisfy monotonicity.

Monotonicity and ADM-compatibility imply $m_{QL}(\Omega) \leq m_{ADM}(M, g)$ for any region Ω embedded isometrically in an (M, g) satisfying (as always) the PMT conditions. This motivates the following definition [4, 30]

Definition 4 Let $\mathcal{PM}$ denote the set of all asymptotically flat 3-manifolds (M, g) of non-negative scalar curvature, with boundary which if non-empty, consists of compact outermost horizons, and such that (M, g) has no other horizons. For any bounded open connected region (Ω, g) , let $\mathcal{PM}(\Omega)$ be the set of $(M, g) \in \mathcal{PM}$ such that Ω embeds isometrically into M , and define

$$m_{QL}(\Omega) = \inf\{m_{ADM}(M, g) : (M, g) \in \mathcal{PM}(\Omega)\}. \quad (3.2)$$

We say that M satisfying these conditions is an admissible extension of Ω .

The horizon condition serves to exclude examples which hide Ω inside an arbitrarily small neck, which would force the infimum to zero. This is a refinement [30] of the original definition [4], which prohibited horizons altogether.

Clearly $m_{QL}(\Omega)$ is well-defined and finite, once the region Ω admits just one admissible extension. The PMT with horizon boundary implies non-negativity, and monotonicity follows directly. Strict positivity of m_{QL} was established in [30], with the slightly weaker rigidity conclusion that if $m_{QL}(\Omega) = 0$ then Ω is locally flat. Agreement with the spherical mass, and the ADM limit condition, follows also from [30]. Bray's results imply that $m_{QL}(\Omega)$ agrees with the black hole mass in the limit as Ω shrinks down to a black hole. In addition, $m_{QL}(\Omega) \leq m_{ADM}(M)$ for any admissible extension M , so m_{QL} is the optimal quasi-local mass definition with respect to this condition.

The optimal form of the horizon condition remains conjectural. Bray has suggested an alternative condition, that Ω be a “strictly minimizing hull” [30] in M , so $\Sigma = \partial\Omega$ has the least area amongst all enclosing surfaces in the exterior. In this case we say Σ is *outer minimizing*, and denote by $\tilde{m}_{QL}(\Omega)$ the quasilocal mass function defined by restricting admissible extensions to those M in which Σ is outer minimizing. For this modified definition the Penrose inequality [30, 12] applies to show that if $\partial\Omega$ embeds into the Schwarzschild 3-manifold with the same induced metric and mean curvature (cf. (4.1), (4.2)) and encloses the horizon, then $m_{QL}(\Omega) = M$. It is not clear how to establish this natural result for the unmodified definition $m_{QL}(\Omega)$.

4. Static metrics

Although in many respects the definition of m_{QL} is quite satisfactory, it is not constructive, and thus it is important to determine computational methods. The key is the following [4]

Conjecture 5 *The infimum in m_{QL} is realised by a 3-metric agreeing with Ω in the interior, static (1.4) in the exterior region, and such that the metric is Lipschitz-continuous across the matching surface Σ , and the mean curvatures of the two sides agree along Σ .*

A similar conjecture for the space-time generalisation of the quasi-local mass, asserts that the exterior metric is *stationary*, ie. admits a timelike Killing field [4, 7].

As motivation for this conjecture, note first that if $R(g) > 0$ in some region, then a conformal factor ϕ can be found such that $\phi^4 g$ has less mass and $R(\phi^4 g) \geq 0$. Thus a mass-minimizing metric for (4), if such a metric exists, must have vanishing scalar curvature. Now if the linearization $DR(g)h = \delta_g \delta_g h - \Delta \text{tr}_g h - \text{Ric} \cdot h$ is surjective then g admits a variation which produces positive scalar curvature. The formal obstruction to surjectivity is non-trivial $\ker DR(g)^*$, which leads to the static metric equations (1.4). Corvino [17] shows that if $\ker DR(g)^*$ is trivial in $U \subset M$ then there are compactly supported metric variations in U which increase the scalar curvature. This gives

Theorem 6 *If (M, g) realizes the infimum in Definition 4, then there is a $V \in C^\infty(M \setminus \Omega)$ such that g, V satisfy the static metric equations (1.4) in $M \setminus \Omega$.*

This suggests a computational algorithm for determining $m_{QL}(\Omega)$: find an asymptotically flat static metric with boundary geometry matching that of $\partial\Omega$. To determine the appropriate boundary conditions, recall the second variation formula for the area of the leaves of a foliation labelled by r :

$$R(g) = 2D_n H - |II|^2 - H^2 + 2K - 2\lambda^{-1}\Delta_r \lambda \quad (4.1)$$

where II, H, K are respectively the second fundamental form, mean curvature and Gauss curvature of the leaves, λ is the lapse function, $n = \lambda^{-1}\partial_r$ is the normal vector and Δ_r is the Laplacian on the leaves. Our conventions give $H = -D_n(\log \sqrt{\det g_r})$ where g_r is the volume element of the leaves. This shows that $R(g)$ will be defined distributionally across a matching surface as a bounded function if

$$\begin{aligned} g|_{T\partial\Omega} &= g|_{T\Sigma}, \\ H_{\partial\Omega} &= H_\Sigma. \end{aligned} \quad (4.2)$$

Conjecture 7 *(Ω, g) determines a unique static asymptotically flat manifold (S, g) with boundary $\Sigma \simeq \partial\Omega$ satisfying (4.2).*

If true, this would give a prime candidate for the minimal mass extension. It is known (Pengzi Miao, private communication) that the boundary conditions (4.2) are elliptic for (1.4).

It is tempting to conjecture that mass-minimizing sequences for m_{QL} should converge to a static metric. For example, [3, Theorem 5.2] shows that a sequence of metrics g_k , close in the weighted Sobolev space $W_{-\tau}^{2,q}$, $q > 3, \tau > 1/2$, to the flat metric δ on $\mathbb{R}^3$ and such that $m_{ADM}(g_k) \rightarrow 0$, converges strongly to δ in $W^{1,2}$. Similar results, under rather different size conditions, are given in [21], and a discussion of the general “weak compactness” conjecture may be found in [30].

5. Estimating quasi-local mass

To estimate m_{QL} from above, it suffices to construct admissible extensions — metrics with non-negative scalar curvature and satisfying (4.2). These boundary conditions exclude the usual conformal method. Instead, metrics in *quasi-spherical* form [6]

$$g = u^2 dr^2 + (r d\vartheta + \beta^1 dr)^2 + (r \sin \vartheta d\varphi + \beta^2 dr)^2 \quad (5.1)$$

satisfy a parabolic equation for u on S^2 evolving in the radial direction, when $R(g) = 0$, with β^1, β^2 freely specifiable. Since the metric 2-spheres S_r^2 have mean curvature $H_r = (2 - \operatorname{div}_{S^2} \beta)/ur > 0$, (5.1) provides admissible extensions for $\partial\Omega = S_r^2$ with mean curvature $H > 0$. The underlying parabolic equation derives from (4.1), and has been generalized to non-spherical foliations in [49]. As an application, choosing $\beta = 0$ we can show

Theorem 8 Suppose $\partial\Omega = S_r^2$ metrically, with $H \geq 0$. Then

$$m_{QL}(\Omega) \leq \frac{1}{2}r(1 - \frac{1}{4}r^2 \min_{\partial\Omega} H^2). \quad (5.2)$$

This bound is sharp when Ω is a flat ball or a Schwarzschild horizon.

Finding lower bounds for $m_{QL}(\Omega)$ is more difficult. Bray's definition of *inner mass* [12, p243] gives a lower bound, but for $\tilde{m}_{QL}(\Omega)$. The difficulty here as above lies in showing that a horizon inside Ω remains outermost when the inner region is glued to a general exterior region $M_{\text{ext}} \subset M \in \mathcal{PM}(\Omega)$. This follows easily when $\Sigma = \partial\Omega$ is outer-minimizing in M_{ext} , as guaranteed by the definition for $\tilde{m}_{QL}(\Omega)$.

On physical grounds one expects that if “too much” matter is compressed into region which is “too small”, then a black hole must be present. The geometric challenge lies in making this heuristic statement precise, and the only result in this direction has been [47], which gives quantitative measures which guarantee the existence of a black hole. An observation by Walter Simon (private communication) is thus very interesting: if $m_{QL}(\Omega) = 1$ (say) and Ω embeds isometrically into a complete asymptotically flat manifold M without boundary and with non-negative scalar curvature, and such that $m_{ADM}(M) < 1$, then M must have a horizon. This reinforces the importance of finding good lower bounds for m_{QL} , since the existence of a horizon in a similar situation with $\tilde{m}_{QL}$ does not follow.

References

- [1] R. Arnowitt, S. Deser, and C. Misner. Coordinate invariance and energy expressions in general relativity. *Phys. Rev.*, 122:997–1006, 1961.
- [2] C. Bär. Lower eigenvalue estimates for Dirac operators. *Math. Ann.*, 293:39–46, 1992.
- [3] R. Bartnik. The mass of an asymptotically flat manifold. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 39:661–693, 1986.
- [4] R. Bartnik. New definition of quasilocal mass. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 62(20):2346–2348, May 1989.
- [5] R. Bartnik. The regularity of variational maximal surfaces. *Acta Math.*, 1989.
- [6] R. Bartnik. Quasi-spherical metrics and prescribed scalar curvature. *J. Diff. Geom.*, 37:31–71, 1993.
- [7] R. Bartnik. Energy in general relativity. In Shing-Tung Yau, editor, *Tsing Hua Lectures on Analysis and Geometry*, pages 5–28. International Press, 1997.
- [8] R. Bartnik and P. Chruściel. On spectral boundary conditions for Dirac-type equations. preprint, 2002.
- [9] G. Bergqvist. Quasilocal mass for event horizons. *Class. Quant. Grav.*, 9:1753–1768, 1992.
- [10] G. Bergqvist. Positivity and definitions of mass. *Class. Quant. Gravity*, 9:1917–1922, 1992.
- [11] D. H. Bernstein and K. P. Tod. Penrose's quasilocal mass in a numerically computed space-time. *Phys. Rev.*, D49:2808–2819, 1994.
- [12] H. Bray. Proof of the Riemannian Penrose inequality using the positive mass theorem. *J. Diff. Geom.*, 59:177–267, 2001.

- [13] G. Bunting and A. K. M. Masood ul alam. Non-existence of multiple black holes in asymptotically Euclidean static vacuum space-time. *Gen. Rel. Grav.*, 19:147, 1987.
- [14] D. Christodoulou and S.-T. Yau. Some remarks on the quasi-local mass. In J. Isenberg, editor, *Mathematics and General Relativity*, Contemporary Mathematics. American Math. Society, 1988.
- [15] P. T. Chruściel. Boundary conditions at spatial infinity from a Hamiltonian point of view. In P. G. Bergmann and V. de Sabbata, editors, *Topological properties and global structure of space-time*. Plenum, New York, 1986.
- [16] P. T. Chruściel and G. Nagy. The mass of spacelike hypersurfaces in asymptotically anti-de Sitter spacetimes. *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.*, 5, 2001.
- [17] J. Corvino. Scalar curvature deformation and a gluing construction for the Einstein constraint equations. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 214:137–189, 2000.
- [18] A. Dimakis and F. Müller-Hoissen. Spinor fields and the positive energy theorem. *Class. Quantum Grav.*, 7:283–295, 1990.
- [19] A. J. Dougan and L. J. Mason. Quasi-local mass constructions with positive gravitational energy. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 67:2119–2123, 1991.
- [20] D. M. Eardley. Global problems in numerical relativity. In L. Smarr, editor, *Sources of Gravitational Radiation*, pages 127–138. Cambridge UP, 1979.
- [21] F. Finster and I. Kath. Curvature estimates in asymptotically flat manifolds of positive scalar curvature. MPI Leipzig preprint, 2001.
- [22] G. T. Horowitz G. W. Gibbons, S. W. Hawking and M. J. Perry. Positive mass theorems for black holes. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 88:295–308, 1983.
- [23] R. Geroch. Energy extraction. *Ann. N.Y. Acad. Sci.*, 224:108–117, 1973.
- [24] G. W. Gibbons. The isoperimetric and Bogomolny inequalities for black holes. In T. Willmore and N. Hitchin, editors, *Global Riemannian Geometry*, chapter 6, pages 194–202. Ellis Harwood, Chichester, April 1984.
- [25] S. W. Hawking. Gravitational radiation in an expanding universe. *J. Math. Phys.*, 9:598–604, 1968.
- [26] S. W. Hawking and G. R. Ellis. *The large-scale structure of spacetime*. Cambridge UP, Cambridge, 1973.
- [27] M. Herzlich. A Penrose-like inequality for the mass on Riemannian asymptotically flat manifolds. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 188:121–133, 1997.
- [28] O. Hijazi. A conformal lower bound for the smallest eigenvalue of the Dirac operator and Killing spinors. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 104:151–162, 1986.
- [29] G. Huysken and T. Ilmanen. The Riemannian Penrose inequality. *Int. Math. Res. Not.*, 20:1045–1058, 1997.
- [30] G. Huysken and T. Ilmanen. The inverse mean curvature flow and the Riemannian Penrose inequality. *J. Diff. Geom.*, 59:353–438, 2001.
- [31] W. Israel. Event horizons in static electrovac space-times. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 8:245–260, 1968.
- [32] P. S. Jang. On positivity of mass for black hole space-times. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 69:257–266, 1979.
- [33] J. Kijowski. Unconstrained degrees of freedom of gravitational field and the positivity of gravitational energy. In *Gravitation, Geometry and Relativistic*

- Physics*, LNP 212. Springer, 1984.
- [34] J. Lee and T. Parker. The Yamabe problem. *Bull. AMS*, 17:37–81, 1987.
 - [35] A. Lichnerowicz. Spineurs harmonique. *C.R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. A-B*, 257:7–9, 1963.
 - [36] J. Lohkamp. Scalar curvature and hammocks. *Math. Ann.*, 313:385–407, 1999.
 - [37] N. Ó Murchadha. Total energy momentum in general relativity. *J. Math. Phys.*, 27:2111–2128, 1986.
 - [38] J. M. Nester. The gravitational Hamiltonian. In F. J. Flaherty, editor, *Asymptotic behaviour of mass and space-time geometry (Oregon 1983)*, Lecture Notes in Physics 212, pages 155–163. Springer Verlag, 1984.
 - [39] J. M. Nester. A gauge condition for orthonormal three-frames. *J. Math. Phys.*, 30:624–626, 1988.
 - [40] R. Penrose. Naked singularities. *Ann. N. Y. Acad. Sci.*, 224:125–134, 1973.
 - [41] R. Penrose. Quasi-local mass and angular momentum in general relativity. *Proc. Roy. Soc. Lond. A*, 381:53–63, 1982.
 - [42] E. Woolgar R. Penrose, R.D. Sorkin. A positive mass theorem based on the focusing and retardation of null geodesics. grqc/9301015, 1993.
 - [43] D. C. Robinson. A simple proof of the generalisation of Israel’s theorem. *Gen. Rel. Grav.*, 8:695–698, 1977.
 - [44] R. Schoen. Conformal deformation of a Riemannian metric to constant scalar curvature. *J. Diff. Geom.*, 20:479–495, 1984.
 - [45] R. Schoen and S.-T. Yau. Proof of the positive mass theorem. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 65:45–76, 1979.
 - [46] R. Schoen and S.-T. Yau. Proof of the positive mass theorem II. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 79:231–260, 1981.
 - [47] R. Schoen and S.-T. Yau. The existence of a black hole due to the condensation of matter. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 90:575–579, 1983.
 - [48] E. Schrödinger. Diracsches Elektron im Schwerfeld. *Preuss. Akad. Wiss. Phys.-Math.*, 11:436–460, 1932.
 - [49] B. Smith and G. Weinstein. On the connectedness of the space of initial data for the Einstein equations. *Electron. Res. Announc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 6:52–63, 2000.
 - [50] K. P. Tod. Some examples of Penrose’s quasi-local mass construction. *Proc. Roy. Soc. Lond. A*, 388:457–477, 1983.
 - [51] X. Wang. The mass of asymptotically hyperbolic manifolds. *J. Diff. Geom.*, 57:273–300, 2001.
 - [52] E. Wigner. The unreasonable effectiveness of mathematics in the natural sciences. *Comm. Pure and Appl. Math.*, 13, 1960.
 - [53] E. Witten. A simple proof of the positive energy theorem. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 80:381–402, 1981.